

Remarks

This is in response to the Office Action of March 17, 2010.

To expedite prosecution, Claims 24-81 have been cancelled, and claims 82-96 have been newly added.

New claim 82 is directed to a program table creation method, which has a technical feature of "utilizing said constraint condition solution unit to create said program table again through the use of a constraint solution technique with time length of each of said plurality of contents unchanged, by introducing a new constraint condition according to priorities of said constraint conditions". The above technical feature is supported in paragraphs [0078]-[0080] of the original specification and Fig. 6.

New claim 83 is directed to a program table creation method, which has a technical feature that "time length of each of said elements summarizing features of said lower-rank elements has some range". The above technical feature is supported in paragraphs [0083]-[0084] of the original specification (for example, time length of an element in a higher layer has some range instead of keeping time length of contents in a lowest layer unchanged).

New claim 84 is directed to a program table creation method, which has a technical feature that "said constraint condition solution unit creates said program table on the basis of a correlation between said contents, by referring scores set with respect to said plurality of contents according to user's liking information". The above technical feature is supported in paragraphs [0091]-[0103] of the original specification and Figs. 7A-7D.

New claim 85 is directed to a program table creation method, which has a technical feature that "an arrangement of said contents is determined on the basis of a

pattern of scores of said plurality of contents with respect to a time axis". The above technical feature is supported in paragraphs [0091]-[0103] of the original specification and Figs. 7A-7D.

New claim 85 is directed to a program table creation method, which has a technical feature that "an arrangement of said contents is optimized so that a correlation between said contents adjacent to each other reaches a maximum as a whole". The above technical feature is supported in paragraphs [0091]-[0103] of the original specification and Figs. 7A-7D

New claims 87-91 are directed to program table creation devices, which have the subject matters of new claims 82-86 respectively.

New claims 92-96 are directed to program table creation systems, which have the subject matters of new claims 82-86 respectively.

Sato et al. (US 2003/0114968), the main reference cited by the examiner in the Office Action, disclose the concept that a timetable in a shorten time length mode is prepared by using data for a shorten time length mode. That is, Sato et al. firstly prepare a standard time table, and accordingly prepare a shorten time table by using shorten data corresponding to data in a standard time table. Therefore, a shorten time table consists of data which are prepared by shortening data in a standard time table.

In Sato et al., another content may be added to a extended time table only when extending a time length of a time table, as mentioned in paragraph [0081], "The playback time length for music (a musical tune) is extended by playing the second verse as well as the first verse which alone is played in the standard playback mode or by playing another tune in the same category".

However, Sato et al. merely suggest that another tune should be added to blank time. For example, according to Sato et al., if there is blank time after contents A and B, another content C which has a time length of blank time will be prepared by fading out a given content, and will be just added to the blank time.

On the contrary, claim 82 has a technical feature of "utilizing said constraint condition solution unit to create said program table again through the use of a constraint solution technique with time length of each of said plurality of contents unchanged, by introducing a new constraint condition according to priorities of said constraint conditions". According to this feature, for example, if there is blank time after contents A and B in the same category (if the category does not fulfill constraint conditions), the program table will be created again with another constraint condition newly added and with time length of each of contents kept unchanged.

Therefore, claim 82 (and also claims 87, 92 and the claims dependent therefrom) is novel and inventive over the cited prior art.

Furthermore, claim 84 has a technical feature that "said constraint condition solution unit creates said program table on the basis of a correlation between said contents, by referring scores set with respect to said plurality of contents according to user's liking information".

Thielen (US 2004/0117442) discloses that contents can be downloaded according to user's preferences (paragraphs [0161] and [0183]). However, Thielen fails to disclose the technical feature that "said constraint condition solution unit creates said program table on the basis of a correlation between said contents, by referring scores set with respect to said plurality of contents according to user's liking information".

Foote et al. (US 2003/0205124) disclose a method sequencing music based on the similarity between audio works. However, Foote et al. aim to concatenate music

with similar tempos based on the similarity (similarity of tempos) between the beat spectra of audio works. And Foote et al. fail to disclose "said constraint condition solution unit creates said program table on the technical feature that "said constraint condition solution unit creates said program table on the basis of a correlation between said contents, by referring scores set with respect to said plurality of contents according to user's liking information". Furthermore, Foote et al. cannot deal with contents which are not music (e.g. news and weathercast; can be generally included in a program table) since it is meaningless to analyze the beat spectra of those contents.

Therefore, claim 84 (and also claims 89, 94 and the claims dependent therefrom) is novel and inventive over the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of this application by the examiner is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis Woo, Reg. No. 31,730
Law Offices of Louis Woo
717 North Fayette Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: (703) 299-4090

Date: June 16, 2010